From
E. J. Thomas

WHAT DOES A CHRISTIAN COLLEGE STAND FOR?

ITS ATTITUDE TO OTHER FAITHS.

AN ADDRESS GIVEN AT
ST. JOHN'S COLLEGE, AGRA
BY THE REV. A. W. DAVIES, M. A.,
PRINCIPAL.

Off-printed from the St. John's College Magazine,
Agra,
November, 1916.

LIBRARY

WHAT DOES A CHRISTIAN COLLEGE STAND FOR? ITS ATTITUDE TO OTHER FAITHS.

THE whole question of sectarian colleges is very much in the air just now. The passing of the Hindu University Act and the enthusiasm which it has evoked mark a very distinct epoch in the history of Indian education and have already stimulated the promoters of the Mohammedan University scheme to reconsider their attitude. The keenly patriotic spirit which such institutions call forth is very noticeable at convocation time when the new graduates of the Central Hindu College, Benares, and of the M. A. O. College, Aligarh, make their public appearance and are greeted with rounds of applause from their adherents on the floor and in the galleries of the Senate Hall.

Today I am going to attempt as frankly and clearly as I can to consider more particularly the question of Christian Colleges, and if in explaining their aim and character I am forced to make statements and take up a position which must inevitably throw me into somewhat striking conflict with some of my hearers for whom and for whose opinions I have the greatest possible respect, I can only say that my subject demands plain and definite speaking; but if I am betrayed into uttering an inconsiderate or discourteous word, I shall expect and I shall deserve no indulgence at your hands.

In the first place I would point out that the aim of a Christian College is strikingly different from that of other important religious Colleges in India. Unless I am very much mistaken, both Hindus and Mohammedans would define the objects of their denominational institutions as being the promotion of the educational and religious welfare of their communities. We may expect Aligarh and Benares to become strong rallying centres, as indeed they are already, of Hindu and Mohammedan interests and to provide powerful barriers against the secularising tendencies of modern thought, but the ugly word 'proselytising' has, so far as I am aware, never been uttered in connection with them. The admirable purpose to which they are giving themselves is that of forwarding the highest good of their community in every possible way.

Now any such explanation of the Christian Colleges of India is manifestly inadequate. There are five such Colleges in these provinces, and there are not sufficient Christian students in the provinces to fill any

one of them. The object of a Christian College in India, then, clearly cannot be simply to promote the welfare of the Christian community. I do not suggest that that is not a good motive. It would indeed probably compel the establishment of one Christian College in the United Provinces It cannot possibly account for the presence of five. And indeed the fact is, their object goes far beyond this. The Christian Colleges, and St. John's among them, are definitely and with conviction trying by every lawful and fair means in their power to hasten the day when India from the Himalayas to Cape Comorin shall become a Christian land.

I can very well understand some one saying to himself. How different from the tolerant spirit of Hinduism which is willing to give every great Master, even Christ Himself, a place within its fold ! How different from the broad-minded liberalism of the great Sir Syed Ahmed who declares that rightly understood there is no difference between Christianity and Mohammedanism ! What is wanted in India is some large eclectic faith such as the magnanimous Akbar sought to found in the 16th century—such as Theosophy would have the learned among us accept to day ! The Christian attitude you will say is the very quintessence of presumption and narrow sectarianism.

May I ask your patience while I examine this charge somewhat carefully ? And first we will confine ourselves to India. Will you look at the effect of Christian education here ? Remember the handicap of a foreign language, inevitable barriers between race and race, the connection with a foreign and often unpopular administration. And yet in face of all these disadvantages I fearlessly challenge comparison with the achievements of Christian education in throwing light and hope into the dark places of Indian life. Is it a narrow thing to care for the leper and the orphan and the blind,—to have given its first stimulus to higher education, and even to the spread of classical studies and to the revival of vernacular literature,—to have encouraged the spread of women's education until you yourselves have to turn to Christian girls for teachers in your schools,—to be providing, in the North at any rate, the great majority of women workers in our hospitals ? Is it a narrow thing to have been the first to bring the hope of life from the dead to the down-trodden masses of South India and the depressed agriculturists of the Northern Provinces ?

Please do not misunderstand me. I do not claim a monopoly of philanthropy for Christianity. I have walked under the shade of trees

planted long ago by some kind hand now dead. I have seen the wells dug for thirsty travellers. I have read of the great Hospital system of the splendid Gupta Kings—and seen the rugged boulders, whose inscriptions tell of the royal benevolence of Asoka. But I cannot shut my eyes to other things, and as I sat the other night and listened to the dancers clashing their sticks together in the Ram Lila festival, I seemed to hear that other clink of sticks of which the old Chinese pilgrim wrote more than a thousand years ago—the sound by which even in the glorious Gupta age the outcaste proclaimed to his proud neighbours the degradation of his presence. And I maintain that a college that has sent Brahmin Christians out to live and work among such people as that cannot fairly be called sectarian and narrow, and that a faith which has at laststimulated the people of this country after centuries and centu ries of neglect to found missions for the depressed classes cannot with any fairness be called presumptuous if it claim to have a message for the labouring and the heavy laden beyond the borders of its own community.

But in considering this charge of narrowness and presumption we must go beyond the boundaries of India. And now we must leave Hinduism behind, for Christianity and Mohammedanism share alone among the great modern religions the claim to have a message for all mankind. To India too once belonged that glory. In Gautama the Buddha she gave to the world one of its greatest sons, and one who, though he emptied life of all its richest meaning, yet moved among men as the prince of sweetness and courtesy and was able to set in motion a stream which reached to the Northernmost and Southernmost limits of Asia carrying on its waters kindliness and peace, and which even today has not lost its charm for many quiet minds in East and West. But India, through some strange madness surely, strangled this wider faith in its very home and drove it from her borders; and Hinduism elected for better or for worse to confine itself within the racial and geographical limits of Hindustan.

The range of Islam is wider. If its religious and philosophical ideas run in a narrower bed than those of Hinduism, their current is the more powerful, and has carried the name of the Prophet of Arabia to the far corners of Asia and Africa. From the Nile to the Atlantic practically the whole population of North Africa with one voice honours his name, and their cry is taken up and passed on through the great deserts and uplands to the waters of the Zambesi in the South. The

peoples of central Asia up to the limits of Siberia itself, where the day is so short that the five times of prayer can barely be observed, turn Southwards to Arabia as their spiritual home. In China, some 20 millions of people, Chinese in dress, in manners, and in language, swell the vast numbers who count themselves of the 'house of Islam', and the Crescent reckons its followers by millions in French China, Malaya and the Dutch Indies. In Europe, if its role has been far from a happy or glorious one of recent years, it has left the memory of splendid conquests, noble achievements in Art and Science, a refined and curious culture, and, of old time, a lofty chivalry. But vast as is the extent of this newest of the great religions, amazing as is its cohesive power wherever it holds sway, it is only in India that it can be said to have abandoned the mediaeval spirit, for nowhere else, I think, is it consciously attempting to express the religious teaching of its founder in a form that can hope to win for the Crescent the spiritual and intellectual allegiance of mankind to-day.

It is just here that the contrast with Christianity is most marked. For not only in India, but throughout the whole world, the Christian Church has made and still makes the claim to have a message for the highest and lowest among mankind. From the earliest days she took the name Catholic or Universal as her title, and to-day as often as Christian people repeat their creed they re-affirm their belief in the Holy Catholic Church.

Such a claim may be called presumptuous. It cannot fairly be called narrow. The Christian Church has many and very grievous faults. I have no desire to minimise them. They are sufficiently glaring, they are sufficiently humiliating. But the years as they have passed have brought with them an experience of its power and range which has taught it to be patient, and which has bred in it an unextinguishable hope. For it has seen its message go forth in a hundred tongues and to a hundred races, and it has seen light and hope spring into the eyes of hundreds of thousands of the savage and depressed. It has saved dying races from extinction; it has freed slaves, destroyed tyranny, and given hope for despair. In Korea, the South Seas, New Zealand, Uganda, Sierra Leone, North America, The Arctic Circle—everywhere it has seen the backward races respond to its call, and its path among them is marked by life and light and hope. That is why I maintain it cannot be called narrow.

But this is not the only reason why a Christian College in India claims that it cannot fairly be called narrow for openly stating that it aims at the propagation of the Gospel of Christ in this land. For the Christian Church has more to point to than the raising of the outcaste and the slave.

Although, to use the words of Christ Himself, it has seen its message of life and hope most eagerly embraced by babes and sucklings, it has not turned away from the prudent and the wise. Wherever the Church has gone it has stood for education and intellectual enlightenment. Not only has it been the first to reduce many of the languages of mankind to writing, not only has it spread a net-work of schools throughout the world—it has also been in the van of the highest educational progress and advancement among the higher races. The Colleges of Oxford and Cambridge, the ancient Hospitals of London are all Christian foundations. What the Madras Christian College has done for South India, what Dr. Ewing of Lahore has done for the Punjab could be matched and surpassed in significance in other lands. In North China is a St. John's College founded by Americans, many of whose graduates were foremost among the makers of New China. And a great scheme of a Christian University for China has been planned and, I believe, in part realised. Dr. Sun Yat Sen, the first Chinese President, was the product of a Christian Mission School and is himself a Christian. The Doshisha College in South Japan, the Agricultural College in the North, and scores of other Schools and Colleges tell the same story. And the Church in China and Japan claims among its members not a few of the highest in the land—the President himself calling in Christian ladies to educate his own daughters. Palestine and the Levant are indebted to American Christian effort for splendid educational institutions. Even our own College has played no ignoble part in this same work. Our founder Bishop French in his old age went to Arabia, and his lonely grave is to be seen at Muscat. The builder of the old College here in the city became a Bishop in Persia, and Mr. W. J. Thompson who was the first engineer of this new building has gone to work in the Stuart Memorial College in Ispahan.

This is but a brief account of the work which Christian institutions are doing for education in the various countries of the world. But there is a deeper aspect of it still. It must not be forgotten that when Christianity arose and spread through the Roman Empire, it had to win its way among a cultured and intellectual if decadent people. Behind

them were all the great achievements of the men—Socrates, Plato, Aristotle—whom we still call masters to-day; and the Roman Empire which held with one hand the far and wild islands of Britain, stretched out the other to the luxurious and mysterious East. Egyptian and Persian cults were becoming acclimatised in Rome, and the scorn of the philosophers, the contempt and hatred of the patriots, the suspicion of the Imperial Governors, all fell upon the new pitiful little sect which was said to meet for strange secret rites and to worship a malefactor as its God. But scorn and contempt had to bow their heads in shame, and royal persecutors learned what their later imitators down to the present day have ever since been discovering, that the blood of the martyrs only proved to be the seed of the Church: until at last the faith which had entered Caesar's palace by the back door in the company of slaves and menials, climbed after four centuries to the Imperial throne of Constantine himself; and the Church which had to struggle for her life against the philosophies and theosophies of that day produced those great thinkers who wrought her theology in forms which the more we study them the more they compel our wonder for their boldness and their truth.

Such are the traditions and such the experience that lie behind and around a Christian College in India and which give to it the courage to make the claim which I am making for our Colleges to-day.

But this experience has another important consequence which bears upon the question of what a Christian College stands for. If the first centuries of the Church were a time of intellectual ferment, what is to be said of the 19th century—an age of wide discovery and progress, invention following invention and theory coming fast on the heels of theory? Trained investigators have sought for the secrets of the universe in every field. New and promising sciences have sprung into existence—old doctrines have been called in question—history has been rewritten—and ancient records rescrutinised. East and West have come together—thoughts have flashed from continent to continent—old landmarks have disappeared. Through the midst of the turmoil the Christian Church has passed. Its Scriptures have been re-examined in the light of that modern historical criticism which India still distrusts in the case of her own sacred books. No mercy has been granted, no reverence has prevented the most ruthless methods being employed; and while there has been undoubtedly a wide unsettlement of faith, and while undoubtedly some things have been and still are vigorously questioned—the

net result is to the Church of Christ substantial gain. Our books are given back to us, no longer, perhaps, as the magical documents which our fathers believed in, but as the unquestioned historical record of the religious growth of an extraordinary nation and as the priceless portrait of a Figure, the historical character of Whose features can never again be shaken, and Who as He has won the grudging admiration and almost awe of His critics continues to win to Himself in ever increasing measure the homage of the whole world of men and women still. And so from the vortex of the nineteenth century He comes, and that same voice speaks out quite fearlessly to the world to-day. "I am the way the truth and the life."

For if He is not the truth, then He and His claims will pass. And if He is not the truth then the truth must be greater than He. And if the truth be greater than He, we need not fear it. It must be great indeed. And that is why we welcome from every quarter the revelation of truth.

There is a great saying of St. Augustine, one of the leading figures in the early history of Christianity—Magna est veritas et praevalebit. Great is Truth and it shall conquer. It is in that spirit, in that faith that our Christian Colleges are founded. That is why we claim our place in the educational system of this country. We have no desire to teach a Christian version of history, a Christian biology, a one-sided Christian philosophy. The truest history, the most accurate biology, the most profound philosophy must be Christian or Christianity is false.

It is because of this conviction that nothing is greater than the truth and that all truth can but lead ultimately to the same goal that we cannot feel that the distinction between sacred and secular is a true one. All things that are pure, all things that are noble, all things that are lovely, all things that are of good report—all these should be found in a Christian College, and all must lead the soul to lofty ends. We do not feel therefore, that our task should be limited to religious teaching. We are debtors to anyone whom it is in our power to benefit in any way, and therefore anything that we have received or learned and that can in any measure enrich the lives with which we come in contact, we must give in the name of Christ.

And this wide interpretation of our message—the open welcoming of truth wherever found—the desire to give the best we know to all whom we can help—this in some measure at any rate heals the breach which our definitely proselytising purpose must make between us and

men of other faiths. For they too (do they not?) claim to seek only the one eternal truth, and they too—we can see it proved to-day on every side—seek from their hearts the manifold good of the students in their care. And so we can travel part at least of the way together, and if our convictions as to the goal to which our path must lead are different, still we can walk together till the paths diverge. There are great causes in India for which we may well work side by side—the cause of education, female, primary and other. There are great social problems which we may be able to attempt together—problems of caste and marriage—there is even the quickening of spiritual life in which we can all, at least up to a certain level, find a fellowship. So many of us have come as far as to realise that we have a loving Father in the God who made us. Can we never pray to Him together, for all even in stumbling fashion we seek to do His will? There are so many, I feel, whom the Lord Christ would call to Him if He were here as in those early days in Palestine. Those that are not against us are for us, He once said. Cannot His followers in India to-day claim some spiritual kinship with others who it may be still refuse to call Him by the name of Lord?

There are many disappointments in the work of a Christian College in India. For though perhaps the more surprising thing is its optimism and its patience, yet its disappointments are real enough.

How does the Missionary account for these disappointments? What explains his patience and his hope?

It is first of all the result of that deep-rooted conviction of the truth of his position, which to others can only appear as bigotry, but which enabled the great Athanasius to stand alone against the world; but it is confirmed by the sense that he is embarked upon an enterprise which experience in other ages and in other lands leads him to think must finally succeed, and also by the fact that he can see clearly some at least of the restraining influences which act so powerfully against success.

For he knows already that much has been accomplished. He knows that the idea of a Father God is far more widely spread in India than it was a hundred years ago. He knows that there are scores of men and women who are secret followers of Jesus Christ. He knows that there was a time when the educated classes in no inconsiderable numbers definitely contemplated the open step of conversion as the only al-

ternative to their discarded polytheism. And he sees that things are different to-day. He sees that it is not now the question of either Christianity or Polytheism. In the intervening gap are many half-way houses. The Samajs have arisen offering every stage of reform. A man may hold and preach theism with strong conviction and yet call himself a true Hindu. He can preach against caste and advocate the most far reaching reforms and yet profess himself a devoted believer in the infallibility of the Vedas. And helping and helped by this process there has swept over India a wave of self-consciousness – a splendid realisation of its national identity, a grand determination to win from the contemptuous Western world respect for its history, its art, its literature and religion. Every College debate breathes this spirit. It is reflected in essays and conversation, it is the commonplace of the Public Press. The cry is 'Indian national self-respect before all else,' and it finds striking expression in the last paragraph of Lala Lajpat Rai's new book. India's " Prosperity and future depends upon the reconciliation of Hinduism with that greater ism—Indian Nationalism—which alone can secure for India its rightful place in the comity of nations. Anything that may prevent or even hinder that consummation is a sin for which there can be no expiation."

In face of that strong feeling the Christian missionary realises that he is preaching a religion which comes with all the insignia and trappings of the West—the mark of that which is felt to be the denial of what India is aspiring for; and she seems to regard it as some steam roller, noisy and crude, which will crush all character and spontaneity out of her life and leave a dull flat track behind it. She feels that the Christian Church is seeking to rob her past of its spiritual glory and to imprison her soaring spirit in a hard soulless dogmatism. What but the uttermost heart conviction will remove a prejudice like that ?

There are some missionaries who recognising the difficult temper of the time are not afraid to advocate the withdrawal of all Christian forces, temporarily at least, from the field of higher education, and the concentration on those lower strata of Indian society which have more immediately to gain by a change of faith, and which have proved that by becoming Christians they are none the less Indians, but that they enter into a larger life than has been granted to them during long centuries of practical serfdom. There is much to be said for such a policy, and yet it would mean the deserting of a large field of service for India. It

may be that for the time the higher classes of India will turn away from what we know to be the best thing that we can offer them, but so long as there is a real service to render, as I believe there is today, I hold that we are bound by the most sacred principles of the religion which we profess, to continue to give anything that we can which will make for the highest good of India during these critical days of travail and rebirth.

Thus far in the face of a not unnatural charge of narrowness and presumption I have tried to set forth what are the things for which a Christian College stands and, as I believe, rightly stands. Now I wish to deal more specifically with the second part of my subject. What is its attitude towards other faiths ? I have already covered the ground in part and I need not detain you much longer. I shall try first to answer the question what is the attitude of a Christian College to non-Christian faiths in general ? What does it think of them ? How does it act towards them ? And secondly to attempt the more solemn and responsible task of saying what a Christian College believes about the position before God Almighty of a follower of another religion.

In answering these questions I think I ought to make clear that I cannot undertake to speak for all Mission Colleges, and that while I feel sure that I have the general approval of my Christian colleagues on the staff of St. John's, it is better that I should be understood to commit no one but myself in what I have to say.

If then I am to describe the attitude of a Christian Missionary towards the great non-Christian faiths, I shall have to begin with the admission that this attitude has not always been easy to defend. There has been in the past too much of abuse, too much of readiness to seize upon excesses and treat them as normal, too ready an inclination to attribute to the deliberate deceits and crafts of the devil all so-called 'Heathen' religions, and the nobler their maxims and their thoughts the more were they held to display the subtilty of the Arch-fiend.

All this or the greater part of it has passed. The word Heathen is now generally reserved as a description of the lower Polytheistic and Animistic religions, and this is a sign of a changed outlook. Greater understanding has begotten greater sympathy. A modern British student audience is almost as sensitive as an Indian audience could be to the utterance of any unfair or illiberal criticism. The modern undergraduate at an English University, even when he contemplates becoming

a missionary himself, will speak as strongly about the attitude of some missionaries as the most vigorous Indian critic could possibly desire. The modern missionary—I speak more particularly of the educational missionary—then comes out with lofty hopes and high ideals. You often tell us that a change comes over us after a few months in the country. All seems so happy and hopeful at first. Then you are disappointed in us. Have you ever considered that perhaps, quite humbly and honestly, we are disappointed in you? Let us leave to others, perhaps some future historical genius, the nice apportionment of blame in this unhappy disillusionment. I do not disguise from myself or from you that no light portion of it will have to lie upon our shoulders. If we are perplexed at first at the apparent lack of the same strong convictions in regard to moral principles which we come to think of as second nature, we are equally blind at first to certain admirable characteristics to which in the West we often pay too little heed:—a lavish hospitality—an ungrudging devotion especially in sickness—a rare power of affection and responsiveness—a touching appreciation of simple kindness. Perhaps above all—if we have eyes to see it, an utter loyalty to causes and people whom you have once made your own.

I have ventured to hint at the experience through which many a missionary passes in India in his estimate of the people among whom he has come to live, because it is reflected to some extent at least in his attitude to their religion.

It is at first a large sympathy and respect. Then when there comes the realisation of how loose the majority of educated men sit to it except in its domestic relations, and indeed how little they know about these very doctrines and ideas which he has been taught, perhaps, to look out for in every educated Hindu or Mohammedan, there is often something of a reaction, and only slowly comes back an appreciation of those great dynamic ideas which, whether consciously grasped or not, lie at the back of general Indian religious thought, and there follows a sincere and humble effort to understand and appreciate the great doctrines on which millions of one's fellowmen have rested for guidance and solace in the perplexities and sorrow that are the lot of all mankind. And as he goes deeper he begins to find that these ideas are no haphazard fancies—they mark and perhaps preserve some great and often vital truth which he perhaps has treated lightly in the past, and they bring it home to him again. I have in mind the great Mohammedan

assertion of the unity and the majesty of God. It cannot have been the strength of military prowess, nor the promise of a sensual paradise, nor even the personality of its founder that gave to Islam its tremendous force and intensity. Great results demand adequate causes. It can be nothing but that vivid sense of the existence, the power, the sublimity of God that gave its driving and sustaining force to the Mohammedan onset. It was a splendid protest against a corrupt Christianity and a corrupting polytheism, and it has left Christians no excuse for the popular tritheism which has crept and still creeps into much of our devotional and even some of our theological forms of expression.

To turn to Hinduism. If general abuse and ridicule was ever the attitude of the Christian Missionary it is not so to-day. There is plenty of room for criticism of things crude and unworthy, but it comes with a better grace from the Hindu reformers themselves. The attitude of the modern missionary is very different. The attempt is now much more widely made to find out what are the great dynamic doctrines of Hinduism—the ideas which really govern the thought of the people. It is difficult at first amid the apparent riot of ungoverned speculation which confronts him at every turn to find a clue which shall enable him to travel sympathetically and yet critically through the bewildering labyrinths. But even if he gets not much further than the threshold he cannot fail to be struck by the wealth and luxuriance of Hindu thought. Its very scale and spaciousness is apt to shame his own small thinking; its fearless facing of ultimate problems rebukes the readiness with which he and many of his fellow missionaries have avoided the questions to which the Indian thinkers have clamoured insistently for answers that will give the restless mind intellectual satisfaction and repose. And he realises something of what modern Christendom has lost in confining its theological thought so largely to immediate practical problems and in leaving almost unexplored the great contributions of the Masters of the early Church. For in the cosmopolitan Europe of their day those wider universal problems formed in a large degree the battle ground of the critics and apologists of this new and daring faith.

But along with so much that wins his admiration, he sees too the gravestones of noble thought. Great fruitful religious ideas—the character of Varuna in the Vedas, the visions of the theistic reformers of a later day—buried among a network of tangled jungle growths. As in

the spires of the Hindu temples the central tower tries to push its way towards the sky, while all about it cluster and crowd the grotesque forms of a crude and monstrous symbolism, seeming to lay unholy fingers on its more glorious hope—so he sees noble aspirations choked and clogged—and he longs to see a flaming intolerance of all things that are ugly and impure and of evil report spring up sword in hand and cut these things away. All about him he sees the reforming sects and he acknowledges with a glad heart the courage with which they have often carried on their campaign—but he confesses to a certain grave fear as he seems to detect a tendency to accommodate themselves to the very evils which they set out to combat—a fear that that marvellous and manifold ocean of Hinduism which has been the cradle and the grave of noble causes in the past, shall again reassert its claim and bury the new systems of today, and that like some of the rivers of this great Indian plain they shall give promise of a plenteous harvest only to lose themselves at last in the arid desert sands.

Finally we come to that most solemn of all questions. What does a Christian College hold to be the spiritual destiny of the sincere follower of another faith? It cannot compromise in face of the plain words of Christ and His Apostles: "No man cometh unto the Father but by Me" "There is none other name given among men by which we must be saved."

No religion can save men. It can only be God himself. And if as the Christian holds God himself became incarnate not simply as an individual man but as man — for us men and for our salvation, then that event and the eternal truth which lies behind it must belong potentially to all who share the nature of man. Its effects reach backward to those who in Christ's own words rejoiced to see His day and who saw it and were glad—forward to our own day and on to the day of nations yet unborn. The salvation which He offers is no Nirvana, no loss of personal identity in the Great Ocean of Being. It is the fully realised and conscious fellowship of the human soul with God—knowing as we are known, seeing Him as He is. The Mohammedan has emphasised for us the splendid transcendent majesty and power of God. The Hindu the awful inevitable relentlessness of moral law. The Christian proclaims that the resulting inevitable alienation between erring man and the perfect God can only be done away by a free act of boundless grace from the side of God, which shall preserve intact His moral reac-

tion against sin, but which shall embrace and reinforce the first sign of the turning of man's rebellious will in penitence and trust towards God. This third term is no mere petty little makeshift of a man-made theology—it is integral and eternal as the being of God Himself. The Cross of Calvary was a picture to the whole world of what it meant to God to give to man the capacity to be more than a living machine—to have that awful glorious power of free will.

There is only one God, and if sinful man ever finds God who is his home—it is this one God that he will find. There is only one atonement by which sinful man has ever or can ever find that Holy Father of us all, and that is by the boundless Grace of the Eternal God who has revealed Himself to men, incarnate in time in the person of Jesus of Nazareth. Nor is there nor can there be salvation by any other.

There have been those who all unconsciously looked forward to His day, and who found in Him salvation though they never knew his name. Others I hold there are to-day whose souls are turning to the light although, through our own fault perhaps, they cannot clearly see what is its source. They are denied that foretaste of the eternal joy which would be theirs here on earth if only they would recognise their Lord. But I believe they will surely find that He was and is their salvation when they pass beyond the grave. But there are others who know well whose the voice is, and what it is calling them to. They have come to Christ like the rich young ruler of the Gospel story, and like him they have turned sorrowful away. And the reason is the same as his—*for they have great possessions.* Not wealth, it may be, like his, but ambitions and plans for the future,—and for the past, pride of race and caste and religion and all the traditions of rich centuries of civilization and of thought. God is their judge not you or I, and the judgement they pass upon themselves. "For God sent not His Son into the world to condemn the world, but that the world through Him might be saved. that he putteth his trust in Him is not judged. He that believeth not hath already been judged, because he hath not put his trust in the only begotten Son of God. And this is the judgement, that light hath come into the world and men loved darkness rather than light."

A. W. DAVIES.